

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/756,830	01/14/2004	Douglas Van Den Broeke	55071-329	3769
20277	7590 04/12/2005		EXAMINER	
MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP			EVERHART, CARIDAD	
600 13TH STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3096			ART UNIT PAPE	PAPER NUMBER
			. 2891	

DATE MAILED: 04/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				A			
		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/756,830	BROEKE ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Caridad M. Everhart	2891				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communicator Reply	ation appears on the cover shee	t with the correspondence addres	is			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failt Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC, unsions of time may be available under the provisions of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communic period for reply specified above, the maximum statuture to reply within the set or extended period for reply will reply received by the Office later than three months after ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATION.  37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, maication.  4ays, a reply within the statutory minimum o tory period will apply and will expire SIX (6)  1, by statute, cause the application to become	y a reply be timely filed f thirty (30) days will be considered timely. MONTHS from the mailing date of this commu e ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	inication.			
Status							
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed	on .					
′=							
3)□	<del>,                                    </del>						
Disposit	ion of Claims		•				
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the apple 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction	withdrawn from consideration.					
Applicat	ion Papers						
9)[	The specification is objected to by the	Examiner.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
	Applicant may not request that any objection	on to the drawing(s) be held in abo	eyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
11)[	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the oath or declaration is objected to be	•	*				
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)□ a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim fo  All b) Some * c) None of:  Certified copies of the priority do  Copies of the certified copies of application from the International	ocuments have been received. ocuments have been received the priority documents have be al Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	in Application No een received in this National Sta	ge			
•							
Attachmer	• •	A	ow Summary (PTO 412)				
2) Notice 3) Information	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PT er No(s)/Mail Date <u>2-3-2005</u> .	D-948) Paper FO/SB/08) 5)	ew Summary (PTO-413) No(s)/Mail Date of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152	2)			

Application/Control Number: 10/756,830

Art Unit: 2891

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-4,8-11,15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Pierrat(US 6,777,141B2).

Pierrat discloses the steps of obtaining a desired target pattern, which are the features of the pattern to be exposed, (col. 2, lines 26-27), the disclosure of the step of resolving phase conflicts (col. 2, lines 6-9) is interpreted to satisfy the limitation of determining an interference map, as interference is caused by phase conflicts, and the phase conflicts would include constructive and destructive interference, as these are the two types of phase conflicts which are possible. The placing of assist features is also taught (col. 4, lines 29-38), and the fact that the features minimize phase conflicts being taught is interpreted to satisfy the limitation that the assist features are placed based on the areas of constructive and destructive interference. The size of the features in the target pattern are less than the resolution capability, or sub-resolution(col. 4, lines 25-28). Optical simulation is performed(col. 6, lines 23-25 and 66-67 and col. 7, lines 1-10), and the teaching that the assist feature results in the features being narrower is interpreted

Application/Control Number: 10/756,830

Art Unit: 2891

as satisfying the limitation that the percentage transmission of the field area is greater than zero. The critical dimension of the features is defined as in claim 3(col. 6, lines 53-60). Neutral areas of interference would correspond to the zero degree of phase shift(col. 7, lines 23-27). The means for carrying out these steps are implied in the process disclosed as cited above. A simulation program is also disclosed(col. 6, lines 23-26), which is implied as containing the necessary files for directing the control by a computer for carrying out the process disclosed by Perrat, as cited above.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

Application/Control Number: 10/756,830

Art Unit: 2891

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 5-7,12-14,19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pierrat as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Toublan, et al (US 6,807,662B2).

Pierrat is silent with respect to scatter bars, anti-scattering bars, non-printing assist features, and the positive and negative values of intensity as recited in the above claims.

Toublan et al disclose that assist features are formed in the form of scatter bars and printable or non-printable features(col. 7, lines 21-55 and col. 8, lines 38-50 and 58-67). With respect to anti-scattering bars, Toublan et al also describe clear regions that cause removal of scatter bars(col. 7, lines 31-36), which would correspond to anti-scattering bars.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the disclosure made by Toublan et al with the process taught by Pierrat because the assist features in the process disclosed by Pierrat would be in the form of scatter bars and non-printing assist features in order to obtain the results of constructive and destructive interference taught by Pierrat.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Caridad M. Everhart whose telephone number is 571-

Application/Control Number: 10/756,830 Page 5

Art Unit: 2891

272-1892. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Fridays 7:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, B. Baumeister can be reached on 571-272-1722. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

(" /werhar/ Caridad everyart Crimaly examined

C. Everhart 4-11-2005